

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 471

32

EA 003 704

TITLE Oregon State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1970: Public Law 89-10, Title I.

INSTITUTION Oregon State Board of Education, Salem.

PUB DATE 70

NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Oregon

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from the Oregon State Board of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053471

State Annual Evaluation Report

Public Law 89-10
For Fiscal Year 1970

Title 1



OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION
942 Lancaster Drive, NE. Salem, Oregon 97310

DALE PARNELL
Superintendent Public Instruction

EA 003 704

ED053471

STATE ANNUAL
EVALUATION REPORT
FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1970
PUBLIC LAW 89-10, TITLE I

OREGON BOARD OF EDUCATION
SALEM, OREGON

Dale Parnell
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Jack Grossnickle
Specialist, Title I, ESEA Evaluation

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ELEANOR BEARD, CHAIRMAN
RICHARD F. DEICH, VICE CHAIRMAN
EUGENE E. FISHER
FRANCIS I. SMITH
W. WARREN MAXWELL
FRANK J. VAN DYKE
FRANK M. WARREN

DALE PARNELL
Superintendent
of Public Instruction

TITLE I, ESEA STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AUBREY TRIMBLE, CHAIRMAN
HARVEY DENHAM
C. EDWIN DITTO
WAYNE FOSTER
REV. EMMET HARRINGTON
ROBERT HUGHLEY
MORRIS JIMENEZ
DOROTHY KINKADE
IRVING MILLER
LINCOLN RAYNES

DALE SKEWIS
Executive Secretary



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
DALE PARNELL

942 LANCASTER DR. NE.
SALEM, OREGON 97310
TELEPHONE (503) 378-3573

Dear Colleague:

Over one billion dollars was appropriated for fiscal year 1970 by the U.S. Congress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Moneys were to be used for the education of disadvantaged children.

Oregon's approximately eight-million-dollar share went mostly to local educational agencies and state agencies providing education for children regularly enrolled in school.

Title I programs have had an effect upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived young people in Oregon and this report helps document that accomplishment.

Information for this report was provided by local school districts and state agencies operating Title I programs. Major responsibility for the preparation of this document was assumed by Jack Grossnickle, Oregon Board of Education staff specialist for Title I evaluation.

It is hoped teachers and administrators will profit from this brief look at programs for disadvantaged children, finding suggestions for refining their own compensatory educational programs.

Cordially,

Dale Parnell
Superintendent
Public Instruction

DP:ms

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.	ii
State Summary of Title I, ESEA, FY70	
Basic State Statistics.	1
Staff Visits to LEA's	1
Changes in the State Agency	2
Effect Upon Educational Achievement	4
Effect on Administrative Structure and Educational Practices.	10
Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged.	11
Compensatory Education for Children Enrolled in Nonpublic Schools	12
Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs.	16
Community and Parent Involvement.	31
Summary of Selected Data	
Data Pertaining to Expenditures, FY70	33
Grade Levels of Students Participating in Title I, ESEA, FY70	34
Number and Classification of Personnel.	35
Instructional Area Activities	36
Service Area Activities	40
Compilation of Budget Proposals	42

OREGON STATE SUMMARY OF TITLE I, ESEA

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

1. BASIC STATE STATISTICS

The following information indicates the participation of local educational agencies (LEAs) and student involvement in ESEA, Title I programs for FY 1969.

- A. There was a total of 356 operating local educational agencies in Oregon, of which 341 LEAs were eligible for funding.
- B. There were 284 local educational agencies participating in Title I.
 - (1) 141 LEAs participated during regular school term only.
 - (2) 58 LEAs participated during summer school term only.
 - (3) 85 LEAs participated during both.
- C. A total of 284 Title I programs were developed and consummated during the 1970 fiscal year. Of the 284 programs, 80 LEAs chose to commit their allocation partially or totally to 18 cooperative programs. The number of participating LEAs ranged from 2 to 14. Intermediate education districts provided directors and were fiscal agents for 7 LEA cooperative Title I projects.
- D. The unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs for FY 1970 was 22,857 during the regular school year programs and 11,588 during summer school programs.
 - (1) 22,019 were enrolled in public schools during the regular school year.
 - (2) 838 were enrolled in nonpublic schools during the regular school term.
 - (3) 11,142 were enrolled in public schools during the summer program.
 - (4) 446 were enrolled in nonpublic schools during the summer program.

2. FY 1970 STAFF VISITS TO LEAs PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I

Specialists from the General and Special Education Sections of the Oregon Board of Education worked as a team with Title I specialists in the areas of program development, operation, and evaluation.

Oregon Board of Education Title I personnel offered consultative services to 32 LEAs for project improvement during the planning and operation of their program. Also during FY 1970, 131 LEA programs were visited by the specialists for purposes of evaluating Title I, ESEA programs during operation.

As a result of visitations by the general and special education specialists and the Title I specialists' involvement during program planning and development, programs tended to better meet the needs of the disadvantaged child.

Participation of various school personnel and school patrons in the planning and development of programs to meet the needs of the educationally deprived children in the local attendance areas was a direct result of specialists actively working with the LEAs to promote community involvement.

As a result of evaluation visits, LEAs were able to strengthen their programs, and the State Education Agency was in a more favorable position to ascertain the degree to which the program was meeting the criteria developed by the federal and state agencies.

3. CHANGES IN THE STATE AGENCY

Describe any changes your agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effect of such changes to (a) Improve the quality of Title I projects, (b) Insure proper participation of nonpublic school children, (c) Modify local projects in the light of state and local evaluation:

A. Improve the Quality of Title I Projects

In an effort to improve the quality of Title I projects, the Oregon Board of Education combined the numerous instructions, guides, and policies that relate to Title I project applications into a single publication entitled Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA. Items included in the publication are the criteria for approval of applications for grants under Title I, ESEA as established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education; definitions of terms used in applications; a copy of the application form with parallel State and Federal instructions for developing each specific section of the project proposal; a section on fiscal accounting provisions for Title I ESEA; a copy of the evaluation used for Title I projects; and other pertinent items and explanations.

Heavy emphasis was placed on the necessity of the LEA developing better methods of involving teachers, parents, and community organizations into advisory committees for planning and evaluation of Title I programs. By bringing together a broad cross-section of the school community to identify the special needs of deprived children, better programs were developed.

Another effort to improve the quality of Title I programs was made by Title I personnel in the SEA by involving SEA subject area specialists and exceptional child specialists in the Title I project application

review process. The special knowledge that the specialists possessed often led to direct contact with LEA personnel in offering suggestions and guidance in strengthening the local Title I programs.

Involvement of the intermediate education district (IED) to a greater degree in working with the local school district in the preparation and development of Title I projects helped improve the quality of Title I programs. SEA specialists held Title I, ESEA informational and planning meetings in the IED offices for administrators and directors of LEA Title I programs. IED personnel in turn assisted LEAs in the development of Title I programs, with particular attention to cooperative projects among smaller school districts.

SEA general education specialists and Title I specialists made field visits during the entire year to help LEAs develop, plan, and implement effective Title I projects and to improve the quality of these special educational programs. Specialists met with groups of district personnel to discuss areas of real concern for the educationally deprived child, to explain the categorical nature of Title I funds, and to help develop programs with sufficient size, scope, and quality.

During the month of May 1970, the Oregon Board of Education held five regional workshops on Title I, ESEA, primarily intended as in-service for persons responsible for designing and supervising Title I, ESEA programs. Actively participating were teachers, teacher aides and related staff, nonpublic school personnel, parents, patrons, and representatives of community organizations. With the primary objective being to improve the quality of Title I programs, the topics presented and discussed centered on community involvement, the need for accountability and comparability, developing and writing measurable performance objectives, program evaluation, and dissemination.

B. Insure Proper Participation of Nonpublic School Children

The Oregon Board of Education has required local school districts to plan with nonpublic school personnel in the development of Title I projects. Project applications must contain written evidence by the LEA concerning the involvement of nonpublic school personnel in helping to identify the special needs of nonpublic school children living within the target area, in assisting with the development of the program, and in identifying the expected participation of nonpublic school children.

Nonpublic school participation in Title I, ESEA is a major concern of the Oregon Board of Education, and consequently the Title I staff continuously endeavors to emphasize nonpublic school involvement. Methods used by the SEA were the printing of regulations and requirements in the Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA, written communications to LEAs from the Title I staff, oral communications by specialists when working with districts, and by special invitation to nonpublic school personnel to attend all Title I workshops and in-service programs.

If the SEA had reason to believe that nonpublic school participation was not adequate, a visitation was made to the LEA to determine the reason and assist with appropriate changes.

C. Modification of Local Projects in Light of State and Local Evaluations

General education and Title I specialists made on-site visits to numerous programs in the state and followed many of the visitations with a formal written report. Questions such as the following were answered: Is the project being carried out as proposed in the project application? Is the project educationally compensatory in nature and specifically designed to meet the special needs of a limited number of educationally deprived children? Is the target population identifiable? Can the project be reasonably expected to make substantial gains toward upgrading educational achievements and opportunities of educationally deprived children? Are equipment and materials purchased with Title I funds being used directly in Title I project activities? Several questions concerning Title I personnel: Does the district have an active planning committee? What procedures are used for involving other agencies in project planning? How are parents involved in the project? What procedures are used to insure access of disadvantaged nonpublic school children to Title I benefits?

If these questions were not answered in the affirmative, a letter was directed to the LEA pointing out the deficiency and stating that the program could not, without changes, be approved another year. Prior to the time for submission of the following year's Title I application, the SEA made a concerted effort to send specialists to the LEAs with questionable Title I programs to assist them in developing approvable activities and services for educationally deprived children.

When the LEA's evaluation indicated that positive results were made, the LEA often incorporated the methods used in the program into the regular classroom practices. If the results were negative, the LEA altered the program instruction or techniques to better meet the needs of the child. Modifications also occurred in later applications being totally different to meet other needs of the educationally deprived child either due to evaluation results not being acceptable to the LEA or due to recommendations by the SEA following a review of the evaluation by an SEA Title I specialist.

4. EFFECT UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

A. Standardized Achievement Test Results, Title I, ESEA 1969-70 Students Taking Both Pre- and Post-Tests:

Data is based on a sampling of 1969-70 Title I, ESEA regular school year reading projects involving approximately 31 percent of the total participating children and a sampling of summer reading projects involving 11 percent of the total number of children participating in summer programs.

The number of children in each percentile range for the pretest and the post-test scores are recorded. The figures represent Title I project children in all grades involved in Title I programs and are based on four standardized achievement tests most often used by LEAs to evaluate their Title I programs. As Oregon has not required specific standardized

tests to evaluate program effectiveness, the selection of instruments for purposes of evaluating programs is the LEA's responsibility. Consequently 266 various standardized and nonstandardized kinds and/or forms of tests have been recorded as used in the various programs from preschool through grade 12.

REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR READING PROJECTS

STANFORD

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	208	216	130	114	59	31	22	5	1	1
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	103	113	135	121	91	95	40	32	19	7
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	22.7	34.9
Median (Midpoint)	18.6	32.2
Mode Group (Largest)	10-19	20-29

METROPOLITAN

Baseline	Number Title I Project Children	91	193	269	335	254	199	107	83	54	17
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	20	58	142	258	235	202	148	138	186	175
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	39.7	56.1
Median (Midpoint)	37.4	53.4
Mode Group (Largest)	30-39	30-39

GATES

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	800	563	397	313	187	207	94	60	39	26
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	452	451	369	342	269	270	243	114	112	66
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	25.9	36.2
Median (Midpoint)	19.6	32.1
Mode Group (Largest)	0-9	0-9

CALIFORNIA

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	195	162	128	81	46	46	36	16	11	3
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	103	122	103	107	58	70	51	33	22	10
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	25.9	35.2
Median (Midpoint)	20.4	31.0
Mode Group (Largest)	0-9	10-19

SUMMER READING PROJECTS

STANFORD

Baseline	Number Title I Project Children	7	14	14	7	1	4	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	9	14	8	8	3	3	2	2	-0-	-0-
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	23.5	26.8
Median (Midpoint)	22.1	22.5
Mode Group (Largest)	10-19	10-19

METROPOLITAN

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	11	20	21	33	19	3	-0-	3	7	-0-
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	5	9	14	12	29	24	3	4	6	2
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	33.1	44.0
Median (Midpoint)	32.1	44.8
Mode Group (Largest)	30-39	40-49

GATES

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	116	66	64	47	24	16	10	3	-0-	-0-
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100
Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	104	65	42	51	31	19	17	10	4	1
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	22.1	26.3
Median (Midpoint)	18.5	20.7
Mode Group (Largest)	0-9	0-9

CALIFORNIA

Baseline	Number of Title I Project Children	9	20	12	14	12	13	5	7	10	12
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100
Post-Test	Number of Title I Project Children	5	11	20	10	10	15	7	7	15	14
	Percentile	0-	10-	20-	30-	40-	50-	60-	70-	80-	90-
	or M Score	9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79	89	100

	<u>Title I Children Pretest Percentiles</u>	<u>Title I Children Post-test Percentiles</u>
Mean (Average)	45.9	51.8
Median (Midpoint)	41.7	50.6
Mode Group (Largest)	10-19	20-29

It should be noted that both regular and summer projects experienced percentile improvement with slightly more growth indicated for the full year programs. The intensity of instruction during the summer projects could account for growth equaling nearly one-half of the percentile growth of regular full year projects. Regular school year projects showed greater gains and affected almost twice as many children.

Substantial positive change in the child's self concept and enthusiasm for school, based on the subjective judgment of the child's teachers, was indicated by a 26 percent sampling of LEA evaluations involving approximately 3,500 children. The two following scales indicate by percentage the children in each category according to pre and post data.

Children's Self Concept

Preprogram	32%	37%	24%	6.5%	.5%
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Superior
Post-program	11%	28%	45%	14%	2%

Children's Enthusiasm for School

Preprogram	30%	37%	26%	6%	1%
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Superior
Post-program	12%	28%	42.5%	15%	2.5%

- B. Projects in Oregon used a variety of instructional materials and approaches in solving the problems of the disadvantaged child. While nearly all reports indicated varying degrees of success, those projects which provided the child with individual attention seemed to be the most successful. This attention came from either a teacher, an aide, a counselor, or a social worker and enhanced the chances of the child attaining success.

The LEA evaluations listed effective activities for all grade levels. The five which most often appeared in the evaluations were use of teacher, volunteer, and student aides; use of audiovisual materials such as video tapes, filmstrips, and taped stories; field trips; use of games, charts, and achievement records/or graphs; and use of high interest - low vocabulary materials.

The projects relying upon teaching machines or large-group instruction were only moderately successful.

It would appear that the student finds the most help when he has sole claim upon the attention of an adult. A well-balanced program providing for the emotional, physical, cultural, and educational needs of the student usually is successful.

- C. There is no data available to either prove or disprove the theory that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to expenditure.

5. EFFECT ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of the state education agency, local education agencies, and nonpublic schools?

A federal programs director, Title I coordinator, and four specialists work in the areas of planning, development, operation, and evaluation at the state level. Additional time is devoted by the total Oregon Board of Education instructional staff to helping school districts develop programs to meet the needs of educationally deprived children in local school districts.

During the past year at the state level four Title I specialists worked with ESEA projects as they arrived in the SEA from districts. Several general education and special education specialists helped develop programs by advising school districts concerning the guidelines established by the U. S. Office of Education and interpreting state regulations as set down in the state guidelines. Nine special area consultants devoted time to reviewing projects and advising school districts of techniques which might be employed to develop special or unique instructional practices for youngsters in their Title I projects. The Title I staff also received help, at the state level, from the special area specialists where supportive services entered into the project.

Through coordinated efforts of numerous department specialists and school district personnel, the projects for FY 1970 were improved.

The major change in FY 1969 project approval was the addition of a review by the Superintendent's cabinet (composed of the superintendent, deputy superintendent, executive and administrative assistants, associate superintendents, and directors of programs) with subsequent approval and grant award by the State Board of Education. The reviews are based on findings and recommendations of the Title I staff. This procedure is still in effect.

Additional effects noted were increased use at the LEA level of consultant services offered by the State and consultant services from other agencies, such as intermediate education district offices, colleges, and universities.

At the local level, many of the LEAs have found it very beneficial to employ a director of ESEA Title I for the district. The director is responsible for the development and supervision of the programs.

There appears to be more cooperation between state agencies and local educational agencies due to the availability of state department education specialists to the districts for the development of Title I,

ESEA programs. This has been accomplished through concentrated field work by state Title I personnel who develop county-wide in-service for administrators and directors of Title I projects during the developmental phase of the programs.

In the area of nonpublic schools, the effect has been one of bringing about a closer working arrangement with local school districts. An awareness has developed, in both the public and nonpublic schools, of their need for a coordinated effort in educating the youngsters of the area. As in the public school, nonpublic schools have improved the educational programs of their institutions through additional funds being made available for personnel and equipment in order to carry out special types of programs for the educationally deprived.

Through the use of ESEA funds there have been noticeable changes in teaching practices within many schools of the state. Areas of change in teaching practices are particularly noted in the use of teacher aides, individualized instruction, and the experience approach to learning. Some innovative teaching practices are being developed in ESEA projects and are subsequently put into practice in other classes and schools by other staff members. In some ways ESEA projects have been sounding boards for teachers. They have given teachers free rein to take projects in the direction teachers felt necessary to accomplish the goals established for the programs. Through their efforts, at instructing the educationally deprived child, teachers have discovered and tried a variety of new techniques. Many of these techniques, proving successful, are consequently tried by other teachers who are becoming aware of a need for the freedom of trial and error in attempting to reach the educationally deprived child.

6. ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

- A. An amount of \$1,000,000 was allocated by the State of Oregon from state monies to augment ESEA programs. During fiscal year 1970, only one district augmented its ESEA program with state monies, which were specifically set aside for use by the district for the educationally deprived child.

The objectives as stated in the project were to:

1. Improve classroom performance in reading.
2. Improve classroom performance in other skill areas.
3. Improve children's background and understanding of the world in which they live.
4. Improve the child's self image.
5. Change in a positive direction their attitudes toward school and education.
6. Raise their occupational and/or educational aspiration levels.
7. Increase their expectations of success in school.
8. Increase experiences that help children appreciate their culture and develop increased understanding of their relationship to other people.
9. Provide integrated educational experiences for greater numbers of minority race children.

10. Help children conduct themselves appropriately in various social settings.
11. Improve the physical health of the children.
12. Increase parent understanding of the school's role and enlist parent support in the interest of their child's success.

The rationale for increased funding basically lies in the need for additional funds to reduce class size and provide intergrated educational experience for more children in an attempt to meet the objectives as stated in the previous paragraph. The amount of \$1,000,000 was approximately 30 percent of the funds expended for the total program. This project involved 5,100 students from public schools.

No compensatory educational programs conducted during FY 1970 in Oregon were operated and supported entirely by State funds.

B. Coordination of ESEA Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs.

ESEA, Title II. Several school districts in Oregon use Title I funds to develop instructional library programs. These funds provide personnel and equipment offering coordinated use of Title II teaching materials for an improved library program.

ESEA, Title III. Title I personnel participated in evaluating proposals submitted under Title III for the State of Oregon.

NDEA, Title III. Many of the ESEA Title I programs use materials and equipment purchased by the LEAs from NDEA funds to strengthen the Title I program in the critical subject areas as indicated under NDEA Federal Guidelines.

The PL 89-10 amendments, PL 89-750 Migrant, PL 89-313 Handicapped, and PL 89-750 Neglected and Delinquent, are coordinated through the efforts of the SEA Title I staff. Title I staff, general education specialists, and special area specialists offer help in planning, developing, operating, and evaluating programs for educationally deprived children in the participating agencies.

Title I personnel offer services to the State OEO through coordinated efforts to achieve the goals established for educational programs which meet the needs of children residing in areas where community action programs are operating.

7. COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

During FY 1970, 1,284 nonpublic school children were involved in programs for educationally disadvantaged. The following information indicates where and when the programs were conducted and the number of children participating:

(1) On public schools grounds only:

During the regular school day	438
Before school	39

After school	12
Weekends	-0-
Summer	414

(2) On nonpublic school grounds only:

During the regular school day	270
Before school	-0-
After school	-0-
Weekends	-0-
Summer	6

(3) On both public and nonpublic school grounds:

During the regular school day	68
Before school	-0-
After school	1
Weekends	-0-
Summer	-0-

(4) On other than public or nonpublic school grounds:

During the regular school day	2
Before school	-0-
After school	-0-
Weekends	8
Summer	26

Programs in nonpublic schools were developed to meet the same or similar educational needs as the programs which were developed to meet the needs of children in the local public school district. Therefore, the evaluation was included in the LEA's evaluation and became a factor in the total evaluation for the LEA. Consequently, the quality of the project in nonpublic schools would be rated with the quality of the LEA's program and gains recorded with the results of those of the total participants of that LEA.

Programs conducted in the public school were for instruction in academic areas of educational deprivation, and the nonpublic school children took part in order to improve their education.

Equipment and materials obtained with Title I funds were loaned to the nonpublic school in order to carry out the planned program.

During FY 1970 no changes were made in legal interpretations concerning Title I and the nonpublic school child. The following information is reprinted from the State Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA, 1970, pages 22 and 23, for the purpose of clarification for the public school and nonpublic schools in meeting the requirements of PL 89-10 and the State of Oregon.

Item 8B of the application form requires the following information be furnished by the LEA concerning nonpublic schools:

Column 1 - Enter the names of all private schools attended by children residing in the project area and any other private

school where Title I activities will be located. Also, enter names of all private institutions whose children were counted in the determination of the applicant's allocation. If the private school is located in another school district, enter the name of the other local educational agency in parenthesis.

Column 2 - Enter total current enrollment for all schools listed, including schools, if any, in institutions. If an institution does not include a school, enter "NA."

Column 3 - Enter total number of children residing in the project area who are enrolled in each school listed in column 1. This includes those resident children enrolled in private schools outside the district.

Column 4 - Enter the number of children who will participate in Title I activities at each school or institution listed in column 1 regardless of where such children are actually enrolled.

Column 5 - Enter the number of children who do not reside within a Title I project area (eligible public school attendance area) but who will participate in activities to be located at the school in column 1.

Item 8B - In planning the Title I program, the needs of educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools must receive the same consideration on a priority basis as the needs of children enrolled in public schools. Genuine opportunities shall be provided for the participation in Title I activities and services of educationally deprived children who are enrolled in private schools and who, on the basis of need, require such services.

The applicant's assessment of needs of children at various grade and age levels must include the children in the project area who are enrolled in private schools. This assessment, carried on in consultation with private school authorities, is to provide the basis for (a) determining the special services in which private school children will have genuine opportunities to participate, and (b) selecting the private school children for whom such services are to be provided. These services should be comparable in quality and scope to those provided for public school children.

The applicant should also provide evidence that public school officials will have administrative direction and control over Title I activities conducted in private facilities.

Further clarification of participation by nonpublic school children is provided on page 55 of the handbook and contains the following information:

Participation by Educationally Deprived Children Enrolled in Private Schools

The state educational agency must determine the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools. The agency has

made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate.

Title I does not authorize direct grants or benefits to private schools. The services and arrangements provided for educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools should be designed to benefit the children rather than the school they attend.

The responsibility for identifying areas of concentration and designing projects rests wholly with the public educational agency. It would be advisable, however, for the applicant to consult with private school officials to determine the special educational needs of educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools.

Before a state educational agency may approve a grant, it must determine that the applicant has provided sufficient opportunities for the participation of educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools who reside in project areas. Opportunities for these children to participate on the basis of geographical area must be substantially comparable to those provided to children enrolled in public schools.

To the maximum extent possible, children enrolled in private schools participating in a project should live in the project area. Needs of educationally deprived children living in the project area should determine the nature of the project or projects. Children who attend private schools in the project area but do not live there may participate in the project if they have the same needs and if it would defeat the project purpose to segregate them from those who also attend such private schools but live in the project area.

Each project application must show the degree or manner of the expected participation by educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools so that the state may judge the total program in this respect.

Title I provides for the participation of private school pupils in special educational services and arrangements. Where special educational arrangements, such as dual enrollment, are provided in public schools for private school children, classes should, if administratively feasible, not be separated on the basis of the school in which the children are enrolled. Only special services and arrangements of a therapeutic, health, remedial, welfare, guidance, counseling, or a similar nature may be provided on private school premises, and then only when such services or arrangements are not normally provided by the private schools. All special services or arrangements provided under Title I must, however, be specifically designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. The extent of the opportunity for participation by private school children in Title I programs should be based on the numbers of educationally deprived children enrolled in such schools who are in need of the services so provided.

The law prohibits paying salaries of teachers or other employees of private schools, or the construction of private school facilities. Mobile educational equipment, if necessary for the successful operation of project activities, may be temporarily placed in private schools, but

title to equipment must be in a public agency. Such equipment must not be allowed to remain on private school premises any longer than necessary, and in no event after the end of the period for which the project was approved.

If there are educationally deprived children who live in the applicant's district but attend a private school located in the district of another local educational agency, and if there is no practicable way for the applicant to provide opportunities for their participation in the project, the applicant may wish to consider entering into a cooperative agreement with the other local educational agency. Under such a cooperative agreement, the local educational agencies could jointly provide educational opportunities geared to the needs of the educationally deprived children of both districts who are enrolled in that private school.

8. TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Oregon Board of Education advised schools developing Title I programs in which teacher aides were to be used, to plan for training programs involving the teacher and teacher aides citing the federal requirements on pages 10 and 11, Part I of the Board's Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA, as follows:

- 5.3 Specific provision has been made for professional staff members and education aides assigned to assist them to participate together in coordinated training programs.

Authority: 20 USC 241e(a)(11)

The 1967 amendments to Title I specifically require as a condition for the approval of projects involving the use of education aides the presentation of well-developed plans for training programs in which the aides and the professional staff members they will assist participate together. The program provided for such staff members and their aides should, as stated in item 5.2, In-service Training, be closely allied to the tasks they will be performing. Each Title I application involving the use of education aides should set forth (a) definite proposals for the joint training of those aides and the professional staff members with whom the aides will work or (b) a detailed description of such a program in which most of the aides and the professional staff members they will assist have already participated. Special attention should be given to the development of the most effective ways the professional staff members and their aides can work together and of ways in which a long-term training program may assist both professional staff members and aides to take on additional responsibilities. If appropriate, consideration should be given to providing the aides with training, leading toward teacher certification. Such training, may begin with Title I funds and continue as long as the aides are employed in Title I activities. After this, other appropriate funding should be sought.

To further clarify the role of aides in the schools, the following information from pages A-3 through A-9, part VI of the Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA is reproduced.

RULES OF THE STATE BOARD OF
EDUCATION FOR THE EMPLOYMENT
OF TEACHER AIDES

The rules adopted by the State Board of Education are requirements to which all public schools must conform to become or remain eligible for basic school support and apportionments.

I. DEFINITION OF TEACHER AIDE

The term "teacher aide" within the context of these regulations refers to persons as defined in ORS 342.120. "'Teacher aide' means a noncertificated person employed by a school district whose assignment is limited to assisting a certificated teacher."

The teacher aide is a person who by definition possesses the following qualifications:

1. U.S. citizenship.
2. An age of 18 years or more.
3. A high school diploma or its equivalent.
4. Standards of moral character as required of teachers.

Teacher aides are to conform to the requirements of Oregon law that are applicable to other noncertificated school employees, including registration of the health certificate as required by ORS 342.602. Any exceptions to these qualifications shall be negotiated by letter with the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

II. Definition of Teachers

The term "teacher" within the context of regulations governing teacher aides and teacher aide programs refers to persons as defined in ORS 342.120. "'Teacher' includes all certificated employees in the public schools who have direct responsibility for instruction and who are compensated for their services from public funds."

III. FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER AIDES

The functions of the teacher aide shall be to give assistance in the work of the school under the leadership and supervision of a teacher. The aide is not to be used to supplant but rather to support the teacher.

IV. ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHER AIDES

The assignment of teacher aides shall be such that they are used only in an adjunctive relation to a classroom teacher, librarian, counselor, or other professional staff.

The role of the teacher aide is one that is adaptable to many supportive tasks. Nothing in these rules should be interpreted as limiting teacher aides only to the performance of classroom functions.

V. REGISTRATION OF TEACHER AIDES

The clerk of each school district utilizing aides shall register with the administrative school district board, county school board or the intermediate education district board, whichever has jurisdiction over the county in which the administration office of the school district is located, no later than October 15 of each year and on a provided form, the age, sex, hourly rate of compensation, educational level, nature of assignment, social security number, and such other information as the Superintendent of Public Instruction may require for each teacher aide. The administrative unit in each case shall transmit this information to the Oregon Board of Education no later than October 31.

VI. TRAINING OF TEACHER AIDES

Districts employing teacher aides shall provide or arrange for suitable training for such personnel to prepare them to perform such functions as they may be assigned.

VII. CREDENTIALING OF TEACHER AIDES

The State Board of Education will require no certificate, diploma, or other credential (except the prerequisite high school diploma or its equivalent) as a condition for employment as a teacher aide.

VIII. SELECTION OF TEACHER AIDES

Persons selected for employment and training as teacher aides shall be those who show promise of being able to serve effectively as teacher aides.

INTERPRETIVE GUIDELINES FOR THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RULES GOVERNING TEACHER AIDES

Schools shall substantially conform to these recommendations expressed as guidelines for interpreting regulations governing teacher aide programs.

I. DEFINITION OF TEACHER AIDES

The teacher aide is a person more than 18 years of age employed in an assisting role. This does not include persons such as student teachers, cadet teachers, National Youth Corps enrollees, nor students in team learning programs.

II. DEFINITION OF TEACHERS

The teacher or teachers to whom aides are assigned should have other than a limited or restricted certificate and two or more years of teaching experience attested by the relevant supervisor as indicating exemplary competence in the skills of teaching.

Where teacher aides are assigned to team-teaching situations this rule shall apply only to the team leader.

III. THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER AIDES

The function of the teacher aide is to assist the professional staff. This assisting function need not be sharply limited to working only with things or dealing only with routine tasks. The function of the teacher aide, in addition to doing such clerical and secretarial tasks, is to enter into the life of the school in a supportive role under the leadership of the teacher. The function of the aide is determined through the guidance and supervision of the teacher in accordance with the requirements of the educational program and the needs of children.

This definition of function is to be interpreted as encouraging a realistic involvement of teacher aides in the instructional program under the leadership of the professional staff. It is not to be interpreted as implying that the aide shall supplant the teacher nor that the aide is to be used in lieu of a teacher. Teacher aides serving in library instructional media centers are not to be used in lieu of certificated personnel, but they are to work under the direction and supervision of a certificated librarian. For adequate supervision the librarian should spend not less than five hours weekly directing the work of each full-time (or equivalent) aide.

The omission from this statement of a list of tasks to be done by teacher aides is purposeful. The omission of such a list is an acknowledgment that, although the teacher aide will in fact do routine tasks, any arbitrary allocation of the work of the classroom to aide and teacher is unrealistic and detrimental to the best use of a differentiated staff. What is important is that the teacher be established in a leadership role and the teacher aide be established in a supportive role, and that within these role identities they approach the work of the school free of exact and externally imposed boundaries of action.

Within this definition of function, the assignment of the teacher aide, where the aide is given exclusively clerical or secretarial tasks, may be such that the aide works with several teachers representing several grade levels.

Where the aide is involved in the work of the classroom the assignment should be such that the aide works preferably with just one and not more than two teachers--except in team teaching situations.

IV. ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHER AIDES

Assignment of teacher aides should be such as to augment the regular services of the professional staff. Any assignment of teacher aides

to any teacher station such as classroom, library, or counseling office should be one in which the teacher aide is an adjunct to a particular member of the professional staff. No assignment of teacher aides should be made which provides for the manning of any teacher station by teacher aides under only remote supervision by a teacher, building principal, or other supervisor in lieu of the proximate supervision of a teacher assigned to that station with the teacher aide. Nothing in this regulation shall be interpreted in a way to contradict the provisions of Section 13-035 of Minimum Standards for Public Schools.

Use of aides in other than public school facilities is restricted by federal law. The Federal Register of Regulations for Title I reads:

"Public school personnel may be made available on other than public school facilities only to the extent necessary to provide special services (such as therapeutic, remedial, or welfare services, broadened health services, school breakfasts for poor children, and guidance and counseling services) for those educationally deprived children for whose needs such special services were designed and only when such services are not normally provided by the private school."

A teacher aide does not offer the special type of service described in this regulation and so may not be placed on other than public school facilities. An aide, however, may accompany a teacher providing special services on other than public school facilities to assist in any Title I, ESEA, project.

V. REGISTRATION OF AIDES

The registration of teacher aides with the appropriate administrative office is for the purpose of generating appropriate manpower data and information regarding the staffing patterns of schools throughout the state. It is not a step toward developing lists of approved or credentialed personnel.

VI. THE TRAINING OF TEACHER AIDES

A. TECHNICAL TRAINING

Suitable training for teacher aides should include technical preparation for use of equipment, paraphernalia and the like and to acquaint them with record keeping systems. It is the first level of training and prepares only for those things-related, not persons-related, functions to be performed by teacher aides.

B. CORE SEMINAR IN HUMAN SUPPORT FIELDS

In addition, where the teacher aide is to serve in more than a clerical or secretarial role, there should be exposure to the human support fields through a "core seminar" format. The purpose is to induct the teacher aide into those understandings from the human support fields having special relevance for education but not to require the conventional, systematic course work associated with undergraduate education.

C. ROLE DEFINITION AND HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING

Adequate role differentiation (i.e., the establishment of the teacher in the role of professional leader and the aide in the role of assistant) is a most critical element for the success of any teacher aide program. Training must include exposure to the means of defining and establishing the role of the teacher, the teacher aide, the developmental nature of role definition, and the significance of role fulfillment in the institutional setting.

The nature of the school and of teaching (i.e., its heavy involvement with persons and groups) implies a possibility of interpersonal stress and the consequent need for human relations training. Teacher aide training should include human relations training especially designed to facilitate communication, trust, and a stress-free relationship with children and adults.

D. SURVEY OF SUBJECT AREA OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

Teacher aide training should induct the aide into an awareness of basic objectives associated with the curriculum. Effective service as an assistant requires awareness of the goals for instruction toward which the teacher works.

Likewise, the teacher aide should be alerted to kinds of procedures used in the basic subject areas. Procedures in dealing with groups, organizing for instruction, handling multiple sources, individualizing instruction, and the like should be a part of aide training. This is not to be confused with a methods course design. It should be a survey to give awareness of the ways of teaching in a variety of subject areas for the purpose of alerting the aide to present-day realities of the classroom.

VII. THE CREDENTIALING OF TEACHER AIDES

Reliance on credentials is no substitute for adequate screening and evaluation of candidates for teacher aide positions. No one shall be required to hold any credential other than a high school diploma or its equivalent as a prerequisite to employment as a teacher aide.

VIII. SELECTION OF TEACHER AIDES

Selection of persons for employment and training as teacher aides should be such that identification is made of those whose style of life is characterized by flexibility and responsiveness to people. A careful screening of persons to be trained and employed as teacher aides is unusually important inasmuch as the alternative selection process of meeting credentialing requirements is missing.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING TEACHER AIDES

Question: Should districts have written policy statements governing the employment and assignment of teacher aides?

- Answer: Yes. Within the Regulations of the State Board of Education, districts are urged to specifically define and put in writing their own policies regarding the employment and use of teacher aides.
- Question: Are student aides, for example, children who assist others in "team learning" situations, or National Youth Corps persons who are employed to do clerical and other routine work, included within the definition of "teacher aide?"
- Answer: No. The term "teacher aide" is not inclusive of young people who are used in team learning arrangements, or who are employed in special programs to give opportunity to the disadvantaged, or who are enrolled in "new careers" or other vocational-oriented educational experiences designed to attract high school persons into teaching. These persons are not to be included in teacher aide training.
- Question: Can training or work experience as a teacher aide be used as an equivalent or substitute for some part of a regular teacher education program such as a foundation or methods course?
- Answer: No. The "approved program" approach to teacher education is the recognized, established program in Oregon. Any equivalency of aide training programs would stand as separate and incidental characteristics of the courses to be evaluated and would not derive from their being a part of teacher aide training. For example, taking a professional course or any other course as a teacher aide or in a teacher aide training program would neither add nor subtract from its equivalency for some requirement in teacher education. The course would be evaluated as any other; i.e., on its own merits.
- Question: Do the rules governing teacher aides preclude assigning teacher aides to supervise playgrounds, bus loading stations, cafeterias, or study halls?
- Answer: Teacher aides who are competent, mature, and conversant with what would be reasonable care in meeting the management responsibilities of such an assignment may supervise such activities subject to local district policy. However, the professional staff has primary responsibility in managing children.
- Question: May children be left in the care of teacher aides without the district or its personnel risking liability for injury to children or other accidental or untoward circumstances or events?
- Answer: The issue of liability does not rest on certification but on whether the responsible and assigned individuals in charge carry out their responsibilities in a manner demonstrating reasonable care and normal precaution.
- Question: May a teacher aide be given a limited clerical or secretarial assignment?

- Answer: Yes. A teacher aide may be used in a restricted assignment. This might be described as a Level I function in which the teacher aide deals primarily or only with things. In addition, however, the teacher aide may be given a more inclusive assignment--one that might be described as a Level II function in which the teacher aide deals also with persons; i.e., children.
- Question: May a principal serve as school librarian by assigning a teacher aide to a library instructional media center to serve under his supervision?
- Answer: No. The teacher aide may not be used in lieu of certificated personnel.
- Question: May a teacher aide be assigned to a classroom to serve in lieu of a teacher under supervision of a building principal, adjacent or nearby classroom teacher, or the supervisor?
- Answer: No. The teacher aide may not be used in lieu of certificated personnel.
- Question: May teacher aides be used in special programs such as those for the mentally retarded, or may they be used to assist music teachers, counselors and others?
- Answer: Yes. The question of assignment is not answered by whether the role of the teacher aide fits a stereotype for teacher aides but by whether the assignment is essentially one of support and assistance to the professional staff.
- Question: Do the rules of the Oregon Board of Education governing teacher aides cover volunteer teacher aides?
- Answer: No. By definition, teacher aides are those who are employed by the school. However, it would be well to have a health card clearance for any person serving regularly in the school even though a volunteer.
- Question: May teacher aides be used as substitute teachers?
- Answer: No. Oregon law requires that all teachers, substitute or otherwise, be certificated.

TYPICAL DUTIES OF TEACHER AIDES

The following list is merely a suggestion of the kinds of services teacher aides might perform and is not meant to indicate that the teacher aides be limited to this list of duties.

Level I

Recording grades
Filing records
Duplicating materials
Operating audiovisual equipment
Procuring supplies
Preparing displays
Processing new books
Repairing damaged books
Typing reports or instructional materials
Managing housekeeping chores

Level II

Supervising rest periods
Monitoring study periods
Listening to reading groups
Assisting with committee and individual work
Reading stories to class
Assisting children in drill and review
Supervising playground, lunchroom, etc.
Assisting children who become ill
Calling at home for counselor
Doing routine errands for administrator

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS ON THE USE OF AIDES IN LIBRARIES

The duties of an aide in a library should be confined to the routine and clerical activities associated with shelving and finding books, magazines, and other materials for teachers and pupils, the mechanical aspects of processing and cataloging, such as typing cards, and the technical tasks of maintaining and distributing equipment. Thus, if an aide is permitted to take over sole management of a library without professional library supervision on a regular, continuing basis, it is a violation of the regulations for use of teacher aides.

Under provisions of Minimum Standards for Public Schools, as approved by the State Board of Education 1967, the following statements would seem to define the role of aides serving in libraries:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. In schools employing eight or fewer classroom teachers, aides may serve as clerks in the school library only if they have adequate supervision and direction from the local district or the IED level. It is our staff's opinion that minimum acceptable supervision requires the supervisory services of a certificated librarian for not less than five hours weekly. A school may contract for the services of a librarian if supervision is not provided by the local district or by the IED.
2. In schools employing 9 to 24 classroom teachers, aides may be employed to assist, but not substitute for, the half-time certificated librarian required by Minimum Standards for Public Schools.
3. In schools employing 25 or more classroom teachers, aides may be employed to assist, but not substitute for, the full-time certificated librarian required by Minimum Standards for Public Schools.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Aides may be employed to assist, but not substitute for, the certificated librarians required by Minimum Standards for Public Schools.

COORDINATED TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING

During FY 70, 143 individual LEAs carried on coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs involving 883 aides. The training programs include all staff involved in working with the educationally deprived child. The training programs for aides were usually in connection with specific responsibilities; however, occasional sessions were held for instruction in such areas as assisting in charting activities and precision teaching, use of new equipment, duties and responsibilities.

The general activities of the in-services were designed to help teachers and teacher-aides meet the needs of the handicapped child through coordinated efforts. The following examples of in-service submitted by three districts are included in an effort to illustrate several LEA efforts at improving instruction for the educationally disadvantaged child.

LINN-BENTON IED

An intermediate education district office encompassing two counties developed and successfully completed a cooperative in-service for teacher-teacher aides involved in schools with Title I programs. The Linn-Benton Teacher Aide Training Program proposed to train adults to the degree that they were competent effective paraprofessionals who could help teachers.

The training workshop was 90 hours in length. Half of the time was spent in work sessions at the intermediate education district office and the other half was spent in the schools with the trainees working on an "intern basis" with the teachers. The trainees worked with the teachers in actual classroom situations practicing the skills, techniques, and concepts learned at the study sessions.

The work sessions were designed to give the trainees opportunities to learn skills, techniques, information, concepts, and abilities needed to function effectively in the schools.

The main objectives of the training program were:

1. To demonstrate the operation and use of instructional media.
2. To stimulate an awareness of interpersonal relationships, ethical conduct, and differentiated roles.
3. To describe the normal growth patterns, needs, and drives of children.
4. To explain to teacher aides the broad educational goals and information regarding how these goals are accomplished.
5. To teach paraprofessionals the school laws appropriate to their work.
6. To provide the paraprofessionals practical techniques in developing attractive, useful, and informative bulletin board displays.
7. To provide the paraprofessionals opportunities to have actual experience in local schools helping teachers.

Each trainee was asked to complete a questionnaire pre and post the training program. Video taping of trainees in action was done during the training sessions. Each trainee maintained a personal log of progress throughout the training program. Personal interviews with cooperating teachers and administrators were held. An attempt to obtain some data from the parents was done through the use of an opinionnaire.

An evaluation team composed of four members of the Advisory Council was used to determine the effectiveness and success of the training program. This team also decided whether or not the objectives were met.

ROSEBURG

Since the Title I program had been an ongoing program for several years, in-service was geared to the needs of the staff in terms of experience.

During the first week of September experienced staff members began screening children for admittance to the program; the new staff members met with the program director and some of the experienced staff in a workshop designed to prepare them for their new assignments. Daily meetings lasted four hours for teachers and six hours for aides. Content of the workshop included:

1. General information concerning program structure, school policies, job requirements, and roles of various members of a differentiated staff.
2. Seminar discussions of pertinent topics dealing with needs of educationally disadvantaged children, management control, positive reinforcement, and learning philosophy.
3. Instruction through various means including the use of video tapes to demonstrate specific skills and techniques to be used in the program.

During the school year there were bi-weekly, two-hour meetings in which both teachers and assistants participated. The additional in-service sessions were seminars and/or demonstrations which, at times, included the services of consultants from outside the local school system.

In addition, through the year there were daily co-planning periods and communication between the assistant and the teacher to whom she was assigned, as well as intermittent supervision by the program director.

ROCKWOOD

Implementation of the Title I Program

In-service for Staff Members

During the week of June 15 to 19, 1970, the staff met daily from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. in an effort to learn more about children, problems of the disadvantaged, of continued lack of success, of visual motor coordination, and of teaching to meet the needs of all of the children in the Title I program.

The first meeting began with an introduction to the program and personal introductions of all the staff members involved. The superintendent of schools presented challenges for the 1970 Title I program. He suggested that the program become more responsive to the public it serves by assisting them in developing an awareness of its purposes and direction. The staff was charged with the responsibility of:

1. Say what you're going to do
2. Determine the cost
3. Be accountable for the cost through evaluation and assessment.

He emphasized the need of measurable results and further stated that for each child in the program we should know:

1. Why he's in the program
2. What he needs
3. How this can be accomplished.

The superintendent stated that these measures would allow the staff to study the growth of each child in the summer school. In addition to changes in student academic performance, self-image, and general behavior, it was indicated that staff members would also experience change.

The project writer emphasized the need for establishment of "a measure" and "Criteria for evaluating the measure." From this the child can be measured when he enters school and measured while he is progressing.

A psychological consultant spoke to the group about bridging the generation gap and letting children know that they are important and that they have something to offer society. The most important change in a program like this is for children to discover that there is something that they can do well. They will see people smiling at them and listening to them, and as their world expands their thirst for academic knowledge will also grow. Before any of this can occur a child must be able to trust and listen to the teacher. No education takes place when a child stops listening.

A panel of two mothers and a psychologist discussed how children live with Twentieth Century attitudes. It seemed to be agreed that parents and teachers are working toward the same goal, but are simply using different tactics. What type of feelings do we really want to generate in children?

Monday afternoon's session began with some thoughts from a psychiatrist. A child is brought to a psychiatrist when the environment has failed to meet his needs. This could be a child with an immature nervous system. Schools can't handle all deviant behavior, but they should remain aware of the symptoms for the signals of trouble. Academic achievement is important to the psychiatrist so teachers should make notes of places where a child is low and not just say that a child seems depressed.

The psychiatrist also mentioned medication for children in the classroom. Drugs are used to either speed up or slow down the child, and they are not habit forming for children grow out of any dependence they might have as a change in their system occurs.

Tuesday began with a talk by an optometrist concerning perceptual motor problems. To help recognize this problem it can be placed in three categories - vision, stress, and symptoms. The optometrist used the following outline to further explain vision to those present.

Vision

I. Visual abilities

1. acuity
2. ocular motility
 - a. visual tracking
 - b. rotation
 - c. fixation
3. convergence
4. accommodation

II. Visual-Motor Coordination

1. eye-hand
2. eye-foot
3. eye-hand-foot
4. laterality
5. dominance
6. directionality

III. Perception

1. form
2. size
3. space
4. direction
5. color

In summary, the optometrist stated that everything must be working together for a true picture of vision to be formed.

The remainder of Tuesday morning was spent hearing from regular members of the Rockwood School District staff about their parts in the Title I program in the areas of health, dental hygiene, speech, hearing.

During the Tuesday afternoon session, the Title I staff viewed the film, "The Eye of the Beholder." A discussion of the film followed. It was pointed out that we can see only from our own perception. So let's try to look at each child and his folder objectively and meet his needs. We must watch each child as an observer and not become emotionally involved, but at the same time listen to what each child is saying. Teach to benefit the child and not you yourself as the teacher.

A portion of Wednesday morning was spent hearing from Title I staff members concerning their roles in summer school. The community worker, spoke on her contributions to the total program and one of the teachers spoke on the importance of living things to the education of children.

A specialist of the Oregon Board of Education spoke with the group stressing that we have problems both with the strengths and weaknesses of children. But up until now we have let children successfully fail for three or four years before we begin to help them. An assessment form was suggested to help prevent such neglect of children.

1. Educational Evaluation
2. Medical History
3. Psychological Tests
4. Language Evaluation of Speech
Comprehension and Production
5. Evaluation of Environmental Structure

During the afternoon session staff members watched the video tape, "Demonstrations of Perceptual-Motor Problems and Suggestions for Their Remediation within the Structure of the School Classroom."

Thursday began with a discussion of testing and what tests really mean followed by questions from staff members with comments by the psychologist.

The video tape, "Adaption of Psychodiagnostic Findings to Teaching Materials" was viewed by the staff. It was learned that as space increases so also does the stimuli for a child with a motor task problem.

The psychologist again spoke with the group. His topic at this time was baseline data and the place of achievement testing and continued evaluation in the Title I Program. We collect data about children by asking them adult questions which they can't always understand. We must try to make our questions more relevant to children. We want children to be able to see a changed outlook in themselves from their participation in this program. To do this we must check their opinion of themselves at the beginning and at the end of the program.

Later in the afternoon causes of underachievement and differences between boys and girls were discussed as these effect classroom behavior. It was concluded that a friendship should be formed between the sexes. This would seem to have an equalizing effect in their roles. Also the differences in maturity seemed only to be caused by differences in their training.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent working in individual classrooms.

Friday morning began the last day of the 1970 Title I in-service session. The psychologist worked with a group of teachers discussing their strengths and weaknesses, as seen through their own eyes. Before the teachers began the doctor mentioned several points he felt were important in making a good teacher. These were as follows:

1. Should have a broad range of interests
2. Should be someone who enjoys a dialogue (listening)
3. Should be capable of spontaneity and control
4. Should enjoy developing other people
5. Should get along with both children and adults
6. Should have intellectual curiosity
7. Should be fluent, articulate
8. Should have tremendous desire for self-improvement
(very important)

After each teacher had contributed, the doctor summarized. He was impressed by the many things the teachers felt comfortable about. Each teacher seemed glad about his or her career; and as the doctor said, if one doesn't feel challenged by teaching, he/she won't be able to challenge children. All in all everyone present came away with a feeling that he must work to do the very best for the child.

The last discussion group was on motivation and learning. What happens in the classroom to promote or detract from learning? We must consider these variables:

1. How secure the child is
2. The child's attitude toward rules

It is also important to look at what the teacher brings to the classroom:

1. They also may be insecure
2. What power means to him or her
3. Bring temporary physical or psychological state

For the best classroom situation there must be polarity. The teacher should play straight with the kids, the planning should be flexible, hope should be reinforced, and the classroom should be many worlds not just one.

People are also more than one thing, so let's help the children discover aspects of things they like or dislike and try to spell out the good points of each individual.

Each morning the staff members and volunteers met from 8:00 to 8:45 to staff the children in the program. On Thursdays the clinical psychologist, and toward the end of the program a second psychologist, met with the staff to talk about children they had seen or would be seeing.

At each session a picture of the child being staffed was circulated among the members so that there would be no confusion for those who observed or taught the child during special classes. Each contributor told about the child as he saw him. Often opinions were verified, but almost as often there was a different view of the child from at least one staff member.

When there was question or disagreement, the statement, "Let's try to find out more about this child," was quick to be made. The child was then assigned to one or more staff members for a more complete work-up. This usually involved having the child observed within various classrooms, talking with one or both parents, testing, play therapy, psychodrama, and a variety of other measures. These were followed by re-staffing the child. Sometimes the decision of the group was to refer to another agency; sometimes, it was a change of method in working with the child; sometimes it involved the use of behavior modification techniques in which successes and adequate performance in the classroom received immediate reward or positive attention.

The staff members noted the recommendations during the staffing session. In addition, the secretary made complete, though brief, notes of the comments made by staff members and by the community worker. These were typed immediately so that they were always available for reference.

Following each staffing session, teachers reviewed the goals for each child, altered them if necessary, and redirected their efforts with the child. It was quite common for teachers to sit down with the children to discuss the child's goal for himself and the teacher's goal for him. Measurable goals received emphasis.

These forty-five minute sessions each morning assisted staff members in knowing more about children, in learning ways which others found to be effective in dealing with specific students, in becoming better acquainted and more open with each other, and in developing a trusting relationship with specialists.

9. COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

The Oregon Board of Education has long encouraged LEAs to involve the parents and community actively in the planning and operation of public schools in the educational program of their communities. Title I has further encouraged the participation of the community as a whole to become more involved in development of programs to meet the instructional and noninstructional needs of the educationally deprived child.

Most of the programs submitted to the Title I staff for approval were a result of cooperative planning on the part of school personnel and the parents of the community.

Twenty of the 36 counties in Oregon have CAP agencies. In these counties all of the LEAs were required to plan and review their Title I program proposals with the CAP agency. This also was a contributing factor in LEAs becoming involved with the community in the planning of ESEA programs.

Included in the Guidelines and Instructions for Title I, ESEA is the recommendation that the Title I program should include appropriate activities or services in which parents will be involved:

"The applicant should demonstrate that adequate provision has been made in the Title I program for the participation of and special services for the parents of children involved in the programs. The employment of parents in the Title I projects is but one way to complement this provision. The primary goal of such activities and services should be to build the capabilities of the parents to work with the school in a way which supports their children's well being, growth, and development."

Following the receipt of ESEA, Title I Program Guides 46 and 46A in July 1968, the Oregon Board of Education forwarded a cover letter and copies of Program Guides 46 and 46A to each LEA requiring compliance with the regulations.

LEAs developing Title I programs formed lay advisory committees as suggested. Several LEAs formed committees based on the criteria established in ESEA Title I Program Guide 46. The majority of LEAs, however, developed committees as suggested in the subsequent guide #46A:

- (a) utilization of existing committees or groups with adequate community and parent representation; (b) modification of existing organizations to provide for such representation; or
- (c) arrangement of public meetings in which interested community and parent representatives may take part in project development.

SUMMARY OF

SELECTED DATA

Selected Data Pertaining to P.L. 89-10, Title I
Expenditures by County for FY 1970

County	Total No. of LEAs	Total No. LEAs Eligible	Total No. LEAs Participating	Maximum Grant	Amount expended in approved projects	No. of LEAs in cooperative projects*
Baker	4	4	4	\$ 53,472	\$ 48,691	
Benton	12	12	8	64,632	64,578	3-1
Clackamas	34	34	23	351,390	349,182	3-1
Clatsop	6	6	5	88,199	87,128	
Columbia	9	9	8	93,389	93,313	2-1
Coos	6	6	6	181,730	176,716	
Crook	1	1	1	45,841	45,841	
Curry	8	8	6	35,650	34,345	3-1
Deschutes	4	4	3	106,482	106,482	
Douglas	16	15	14	241,985	236,742	
Gilliam	3	3	1	3,184	3,184	
Grant	6	6	6	14,166	13,561	5-1
Harney	16	16	16	21,106	20,851	14-1
Hood River	1	1	1	32,948	32,134	
Jackson	10	10	8	290,484	286,022	
Jefferson	4	2	2	30,402	29,242	
Josephine	2	2	2	158,676	144,665	2-1
Klamath	3	3	3	176,715	169,313	
Lake	9	8	8	29,701	29,255	6-1
Lane	16	16	14	483,693	470,699	3-1
Lincoln	1	1	1	122,575	115,638	
Linn	36	35	23	159,071	158,259	3-1
Malheur	16	9	9	150,974	148,242	8-1
Marion	37	37	33	673,768	666,140	5-2
Morrow	1	1	1	13,047	12,510	
Multnomah	14	14	12	1,877,845	1,875,702	
Polk	6	5	4	105,085	104,488	
Sherman	6	6	6	2,974	2,815	6-1
Tillamook	7	7	7	55,572	54,807	2-1
Umatilla	16	16	13	151,957	142,251	4-1
Union	6	6	5	50,139	49,599	
Wallowa	6	4	2	12,176	10,767	
Wasco	9	9	7	66,766	66,766	7-1
Washington	13	13	11	283,879	260,328	4-1
Wheeler	3	3	2	4,727	4,719	
Yamhill	9	9	9	201,153	200,530	
Totals	356	341	284	6,435,553	6,315,505	80-18

*The first figure is the number of LEAs and the second figure is the number of projects.

GRADE LEVELS OF STUDENTS
PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I, ESEA
FY 1970

Grade Levels	Regular School Term		Summer School Term	
	Number Participating From Public Schools	Number Participating From Private Schools	Number Participating From Public Schools	Number Participating From Private Schools
Prekindergarten	78		108	5
Kindergarten	1,055	15	790	26
Grade 1	2,343	123	1,299	65
Grade 2	2,585	149	1,619	83
Grade 3	2,617	120	1,606	68
Grade 4	2,342	95	1,356	42
Grade 5	1,896	81	1,147	25
Grade 6	1,742	77	980	25
Grade 7	1,605	80	728	54
Grade 8	1,427	51	550	27
Grade 9	1,374	24	475	9
Grade 10	1,385	6	242	7
Grade 11	901	10	180	10
Grade 12	669	7	62	
TOTALS	22,019	838	11,142	446

NUMBER AND CLASSIFICATION OF PERSONNEL IN OREGON SCHOOLS
EMPLOYED WITH TITLE I FUNDS
FY 1970

Type Of Personnel	Number of Personnel			
	Regular School Term		Summer School Term	
	Total	FTE*	Total	FTE*
Teaching-Prekindergarten	3	2.25	14	17.00
Teaching-Kindergarten	13	6.95	46	34.90
Teaching-Elementary	325	228.26	578	507.31
Teaching-Secondary	85	60.03	147	78.33
Teaching-Handicapped Children	8	6.00	20	14.00
Teacher Aide	445	346.69	339	262.16
Librarian	11	4.80	13	11.50
Librarian Aide	39	29.31	10	8.35
Supervision	21	13.80	20	10.55
Direction and Management (Admin.)	23	8.11	43	32.06
Counseling	25	19.68	4	2.35
Psychologist	8	2.90	1	.20
Testing	7	2.15	9	4.08
Social Work	16	12.80	6	9.80
Attendance	9	2.95	4	1.50
Nurse	17	13.48	2	1.40
Physician				
Dentist				
Dental Hygienist				
Clerical	69	39.12	43	33.38
Other: Bus Driver	5	3.10	47	27.77
Teacher Trainee			20	20.00
Student Aides	50	.20	207	63.60
Cooks	4	4.00	9	6.90
Consultants	1	1.00	12	4.83
Community Agents	24	21.60	7	2.20
Custodian	6	1.87	15	10.22
Resource Teacher			4	1.00
Graphic Artist	1	1.00	2	1.00
Video Technician	2	2.40		
TOTALS	1,217	834.45	1,622	1,166.39

*Full-time equivalencies

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR PUBLIC STUDENTS
FOR
REGULAR SCHOOL SESSION

Instructional Activity	Pre K	Number of Children Participating												Funds Expended per Activity		
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	Total
1 Art			44	23	26	70	54	48	36	27	24	21	18	13	404	\$ 18,998
2 Business Education																
3 Cultural Enrichment	238	602	525	501	479	396	357	374	335	282	150	95	29	4,363	210,478	
4 English - Reading	656	2,199	2,325	2,446	2,116	1,526	1,464	1,440	1,144	1,126	843	600	338	18,223	2,462,836	
5 English - Speech		203	197	249	217	157	131	153	128	90	85	84	74	1,768	77,637	
6 English - Other Language Arts	45	914	865	888	736	603	534	630	564	216	600	235	179	7,009	378,967	
7 English - Second Language	8	36	44	42	51	44	41	75	74	55	46	42	37	595	28,901	
8 Foreign Language																
9 Home Economics													10	12	22	2,903
10 Industrial Arts					10	15	15			9	12	6	9	76	5,993	
11 Mathematics	116	381	335	327	333	278	261	263	235	191	132	86	57	2,995	135,690	
12 Music		34	32	34	35	33	32	25	21					246	20,083	
13 Phys. Ed./Recreation		39	40	55	67	70	70	40	51	24	7	5	4	472	20,882	
14 Natural Science		58	34	26	45	15	35	45	29	16	17	9	3	332	7,439	
15 Social Science		79	61	54	82	47	47	88	81	81	18	28	28	694	25,272	
16 Other Vocational Ed.		7	7	6	9	10	11	100	126	371	257	215	211	1,330	105,096	
17 Special Activities-Handi.		55	40	11	37	10	9	5	4			17		188	47,103	
18 Pre-K & Kindergarten	45	325												370	85,192	
19 *Other Instruct. Activities																
(Specify)																
Elementary Study Skills		5	25	10	14										54	20,952
Extended Day	100	116	104	95	93	90	90	93	91					872	12,332	
TOTAL																\$3,666,754

*Covers several academic and activity areas.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
FOR
REGULAR SCHOOL SESSION

Instructional Activity	Pre K	Number of Children Participating										Total	Funds Expended per Activity
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Art													\$
2 Business Education													
3 Cultural Enrichment		36	33	29	23	26	29	31	29			236	10,098
4 English - Reading		112	142	129	75	65	61	69	40	24	6	7	100,164
5 English - Speech		11	6	3		5	2	4	3			34	2,000
6 English - Other Language Arts		49	37	29	21	28	33	42	29			268	12,783
7 English - Second Language			2	3		5						10	1,000
8 Foreign Language													
9 Home Economics											1	1	113
10 Industrial Arts												33	1,200
11 Mathematics		10	6	3		5	2	4	3				
12 Music													
13 Phys. Ed./Recreation													
14 Natural Science		10	4				2	4	3			23	400
15 Social Science		10	6	3		5	2	4	3			33	600
16 Other Vocational Ed.											3	4	400
17 Special Activities-Handi.													
18 Pre-K & Kindergarten	13	21										34	13,667
19 *Other Instruct. Activities													
(Specify)													
Extended Day		3	5	7	6	3	8					32	1,316
TOTAL													\$ 143,741

*Covers several academic and activity areas

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR PUBLIC STUDENTS
FOR
SUMMER SCHOOL SESSION

Instructional Activity	Number of Children Participating												Funds Expended per Activity			
	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		11	12	Total
1 Art		244	408	434		427	310	220	183	96	56	4	5		2,392	\$ 30,122
2 Business Education							3	3	3	3	2	22	18	20	74	1,122
3 Cultural Enrichment		405	738	741		709	525	491	482	381	315	157	90	72	5,135	115,278
4 English - Reading		420	1,183	1,393		1,404	1,197	941	785	493	346	114	98	60	8,461	469,508
5 English - Speech		54	135	143		170	103	75	83	56	31	3	5	5	866	21,938
6 English - Other Language Arts		321	509	489		534	318	179	179	84	44	68	33	27	2,791	63,933
7 English - Second Language																
8 Foreign Language																
9 Home Economics																
10 Industrial Arts									10	14	2	20	4		50	1,016
11 Mathematics		263	398	477		438	334	291	259	200	152	8	5	6	2,835	55,566
12 Music		124	124	124		139	86	62	66	38	30	8	53	31	901	11,044
13 Phys. Ed./Recreation		194	303	315		338	245	150	162	122	74	71	48	64	2,096	21,305
14 Natural Science		144	185	169		192	118	95	103	128	109	75	54	40		41,438
15 Social Science		62	83	51		72	13		19	29	35	51	22	15	456	6,039
16 Other Vocational Ed.										30	35	41	4	37	149	23,157
17 Special Activities-Handi.		15	5	18		10	5	1		9	9	6			78	13,465
18 Pre-K & Kindergarten	434	385													819	73,111
19 *Other Instruct. Activities (Specify)																
Elementary Study Skills			25	14	15										54	2,100
Perceptual Motor Skills			12	14	13	9		7	8						63	251
TOTAL																\$ 950,393

*Covers several academic and activity areas

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
FOR
SUMMER SCHOOL SESSION

Instructional Activity	Pre K	Number of Children Participating												Total	Funds Expended per Activity	
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			12
1 Art		8	19	25	14	11	2	6							85	\$ 770
2 Business Education																
3 Cultural Enrichment	8	33	35	27	20	14	18	14	11	11	30	10			217	3,630
4 English - Reading	26	70	74	70	52	26	37	26	24	12	1	1			393	31,878
5 English - Speech	3	9	7	2	3	2	1	2	2						29	649
6 English - Other Language Arts	11	22	25	18	13	6	1	6	2						98	2,076
7 English - Second Language																
8 Foreign Language																
9 Home Economics																
10 Industrial Arts																
11 Mathematics	7	25	27	19	17	13	20	13	10	7					145	2,398
12 Music																
13 Phys. Ed./Recreation	7	10	12	3	6	1	1	1	8	10	2				60	1,906
14 Natural Science		9	8	3	2	7	1	7	2						32	293
15 Social Science		2				1		1	2				2		5	50
16 Other Vocational Ed.															2	500
17 Special Activities-Handi.																
18 Pre-K & Kindergarten	5														5	626
19 *Other Instruct. Activities (Specify)																
Basic School Subjects													4		4	541
TOTAL																\$ 45,317

*Covers several academic and activity areas

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR PUBLIC STUDENTS
REGULAR SCHOOL SESSION

Supportive Services Activity	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Funds Expended per Activity
1 Attendance		78	103	155	102	75	59	55	68	60	81	79	60	38	1,013	\$ 13,673
2 Clothing		5	4	7	14	5	8	7	4	2	1				57	280
3 Food	210	75	146	137	143	113	134	131	99	128	103	61	138	64	1,482	8,344
4 Guidance Counseling		141	262	252	263	251	268	253	293	317	348	191	148	140	3,127	177,641
5 Health - Dental		18	33	11	21	28	3	107	91	1					313	4,508
6 Health - Medical		50	237	245	249	190	167	167	163	181	186	131	134	112	2,212	50,546
7 Library		62	200	120	126	124	102	100	77	56	107	90	53	50	1,267	49,518
8 Psychological	1	6	114	105	77	59	50	41	51	40	74	34	35	26	638	24,621
9 Social Work		51	314	254	272	209	175	171	121	151	156	192	78	70	2,370	181,739
10 Speech Therapy	1		68	72	40	39	42	43	33	41	2	3	2	1	382	26,376
11 Transportation	23	326	557	384	381	324	272	228	324	303	235	133	161	76	3,727	110,243
12 Special Services - Handicapped																
13 Other Services (Specify) Perceptual Training			53	10	8										71	11,873
TOTAL																\$ 659,362

SUMMER SCHOOL SESSION

Supportive Services Activity	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Funds Expended per Activity
1 Attendance		62			35	14	10	13	4						138	\$ 501
2 Clothing																
3 Food	22	285	325	339	373	319	244	212	193	137	150	48	49	2	2,698	16,176
4 Guidance Counseling	25		28	58	31	36	29	78	124	108	151	13	30	8	719	7,075
5 Health - Dental		87	26	47	21	23	20	20	18	10	8				280	1,572
6 Health - Medical	203	19	21	31	20	41	24	30	25	22	11	1			448	4,999
7 Library		99	282	241	190	168	124	80	80	41	33	26	25	23	1,412	20,130
8 Psychological																
9 Social Work	287	9	101	70	77	69	56	59	30	35	60	10	5		868	8,853
10 Speech Therapy		20	3	6	7	5	3	1							45	1,856
11 Transportation	153	591	746	774	751	645	499	494	341	242	135	84	36	12	5,503	57,115
12 Special Services - Handicapped																
13 Other Services (Specify)																
TOTAL																\$ 118,277

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ACTIVITIES UNDER TITLE I, ESEA
FOR NONPUBLIC STUDENTS
- REGULAR SCHOOL SESSION

Supportive Services Activity	Pre K	Number of Children Participating												Total	Funds Expended per Activity	
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			12
1 Attendance				5	7	4			3	4					23	\$ 130
2 Clothing																
3 Food	15	11	11	10	7	7		7							68	160
4 Guidance Counseling			10	11	8	3	4	4	5	1					46	2,268
5 Health - Dental			1		1										2	100
6 Health - Medical		11	16	17	11	7			10	4					66	717
7 Library		10	16	17	4										47	1,476
8 Psychological																
9 Social Work	4	11	17	18	14	12	1	11	5						93	3,037
10 Speech Therapy	1	1	1	1	1										5	684
11 Transportation	15	35	39	30	22	19	26	26	25						237	7,949
12 Special Services- Handicapped																
13 Other Services (Specify)																
TOTAL																\$ 16,521

SUMMER SCHOOL SESSION

Supportive Services Activity	Number of Children Participating												Funds Expended per Activity			
	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	\$
1 Attendance																
2 Clothing																
3 Food	22	32	34	29	23	23	7	4	3	3	30	10			197	1,040
4 Guidance Counseling																
5 Health - Dental																
6 Health - Medical																
7 Library	4	25	23	21	10	10	2	5							90	740
8 Psychological																
9 Social Work		6	5	1											12	213
10 Speech Therapy																
11 Transportation	22	48	40	36	25	25	20	15	6	7	30	10			259	2,340
12 Special Services- Handicapped																
13 Other Services (Specify)																\$ 4,333
TOTAL																

COMPILATION OF STATEWIDE
LEA, TITLE I BUDGET
PROPOSALS FOR FY 70

Expenditure Accounts	Dollars Budgeted	% of Total Allocation
100 - Administration	\$ 170,768	2.65
200 - Instruction	5,295,209	82.28
300 - Attendance Services	14,304	.22
400 - Health Services	7,388	.11
500 - Pupil Transportation	177,647	2.76
600 - Operation of Plant	37,292	.58
700 - Maintenance of Plant	6,796	.11
800 - Fixed Charges	425,707	6.62
900 - Food Services	25,720	.40
1000 - Student Body Activities	0	.00
1100 - Community Services	109,365	1.70
1200 - Equipment	165,357	2.57
Total Allocation	\$ 6,435,553	100.00